Appl. No. 10/560,063 Amendment Dated September 16, 2009 Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2009

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested. Claims 1-7, 9, 14-27 are now in the application.

Claims 25-27 have been added.

This response is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination.

New Claims:

Claims 25-27 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the published

application in paragraph [0034] of the published application.

35 USC § 103(a):

In item 2 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9, 14-18, and 21-24 as being

obvious over Malodobry (US 2004/0111107) in view of Auguste et al. (US 6,475,977) and

DeBusk et al. (US 2004/0001878) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As will be explained below, the

claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not

been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, a brief review of the invention as claimed is provided.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*, a method for removing pigments from a pigmented section of skin,

comprising:

a) puncturing the skin at said pigmented section with a skin-puncturing device

provided with at least one needle, thereby liberating the pigments and cellular

fluids from cells containing said pigments; and

b) bandaging said punctured skin with a pad adapted to absorb said pigments and

said cellular fluids, said pad containing one or more materials capable of accelerating a process of migration of said pigments toward an outer layer of the

skin, wherein said one or more materials is a salt-based granular paste. (Emphasis

added by Applicants.)

Applicants and the Examiner agree that Malodobry differs from the present invention at least in

that Malodobry does not teach step b of the method according to claim 1. In order to supply this

Page 5 of 8

step, the Examiner cites Auguste et al. and contends that the hydrocolloid dressing of Auguste et

al. could be applied to a tattooed area of skin treated by the method of Malodobry to achieve the

same effect as the method according to claim 1.

Applicants disagree with the Examiner that Auguste et al. teaches or suggest a bandage that

accelerates migration of pigments. The method taught in the instant application teaches a

process that encourages an ongoing weeping of a wound that is encouraged by an absorbent pad

that includes a hydroscopic salt. In contrast, Auguste et al. teaches an absorbent pad that is used

to encourage healing of a wound. Auguste et al. absorbs fluids that are exuded. However, the

bandage is not used to accelerate the exudation of fluids.

Accordingly, Auguste et al. does not suggest, "Said pad containing one or more materials

capable of accelerating a process of migration of said pigments toward an outer layer of the skin"

as is described in claim 1 of the instant application.

The difference between the invention as claimed and Auguste et al. are explained in the attached

Declaration under Rule 1.132. The Curriculum Vitae and Declaration under Rule 1.132 are

prepared and signed by Prof. Lior Rosenberg, M.D. Prof. Rosenberg is a medical doctor with

some thirty years of experience in areas of medical practice and research including wound

healing that are directly related to the present difference of opinion between Applicants and the

Examiner concerning Auguste et al.

In section 5.C.7 of the Declaration, Prof. Rosenberg discusses that the differences between a

bandage comprised of a pad to which a hygroscopic paste has been applied (as in claim 1) and a

hydrocolloid dressing (as in Auguste et al.) is neither the same nor capable of fulfilling the

function required of the bandage applied in step b of claim 1.

Furthermore, Prof. Rosenberg states in Section 5.C.6 and Section 8 of his Declaration that to the

best of his knowledge the method of claim 1 is innovative.

Accordingly, none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or

suggest the features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the art. And, because all of

Page 6 of 8

Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2009

the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as

well.

New Claims 25-27:

New claims 25-27 further define the method according to the invention. To encourage weeping

and migration of the fluid, infection is encouraged while the pad is applied. Such a condition

encourages weeping and thereby fluid exudation that allows the pigment to be carried by the

fluid out of the skin and into the pad.

Such a step is not obvious in light of Auguste et al. An object of August et al is to heal and

reduce weeping. See Auguste et al., col. 2, ll 3-15.

In addition, the Declaration of Dr. Rosenberg, Section 5.C. explains that the hygroscopic

bandage combined with a weeping wound is a particularly unique method for migrating the

pigment from the dermis.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7, 9, 14-27 are solicited. In

the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, please telephone

counsel so that patentable language can be substituted.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of three

months for a small entity pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$555 in accordance with

Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

A Request for Continued Examination and a related payment of \$405 are attached.

A payment of \$78 is attached to provide for three extra total claims.

If any further extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Page 7 of 8

Appl. No. 10/560,063 Amendment Dated September 16, 2009 Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2009

No additional fees are believed due. However, please charge any required fee (or credit any overpayments of fees) to the Deposit Account of the undersigned, Account No. 500601 (Docket No. 7640-X05-045).

Respectfully submitted,

/Loren D. Pearson/

Loren Donald Pearson, Reg. No. 42,987 Martin Fleit, Reg. No. 16,900

Customer Number: 27317

FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO, P.L.

21355 East Dixie Highway

Suite 115

Miami, FL 33180 Tel: 305-830-2600 Fax: 305-830-2605

e-mail: LPearson@FGGBB.com